

## REMARKS

Claims 6-25 had been canceled. Claims 1-5 and 26-30 are currently pending in the present application, of which Claims 1 and 26 have been amended.

### Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-5 and 26-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for not complying with the written description requirement. Applicant respectfully traverses such rejection insofar as it might apply to the claims as amended herein.

All occurrences of the phrase "front-end interfaces" in Claim 1 and 26 have been amended to "front-end processes" to be consistent with the terms, such as front-end processes **212a-212d**, being used in the specification. No new matter has been added.

Claim 1 (and similarly Claim 26) recites a step of "passing said retrieved password from said password registry to said corresponding front-end process for decryption in order to permit said access request." Support for the claimed passing step can be found on page 9, line 24 - page 10, line 2, which states "password registry 210 may then pass the encrypted password back to the front-end process 212b for decryption."

Because all written description requirements have been met, the § 112 rejection is believed to be overcome.

### Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-5 and 26-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable by *Kao et al.* (US 2002/0122553) in view of *Wu* (US 5,774,551) or *Itoi and Honeyman (Pluggable Authentication Modules for Windows NT, Proceedings of the 2<sup>nd</sup> USENIX Windows NT Symposium, Seattle, Washington, Aug. 3-4, 1998)*. Applicant respectfully traverses such rejection insofar as it might apply to the claims as amended herein.

*Kao*, on its face, is assigned to International Business Machines Corporation—the common assignee of the present application. Although *Kao* maintains an earlier filing date than that of the present application, *Kao* has not yet been issued. Thus, according to MPEP § 706.02(1)(1), *Kao* can only be qualified as a reference under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), but is not available to form the basis for an obviousness rejection under § 103. As such, the § 103 rejection is believed to be overcome.

### CONCLUSION

Claims 1-5 and 26-30 are currently pending in the present application. Applicant believes that independent Claims 1 and 26 along with their respective dependent claims are in condition for allowance. The remaining prior art cited by the Examiner but not relied upon has been reviewed and is not believed to show or suggest the claimed invention.

No fee or extension of time is believed to be necessary; however, in the event that any addition fee or extension of time is required for the prosecution of the present application, please charge it against IBM Deposit Account No. **09-0447**.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Antony P. Ng  
*Registration No. 43,427*  
DILLON & YUDELL, LLP  
8911 N. Capital of Texas Hwy., suite 2110  
Austin, Texas 78759  
(512) 343-6116

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT